UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/354,870	07/16/1999	ROBERT D. WILSON	BL01134-012	5681

8698 7590 05/07/2003

STANDLEY & GILCREST LLP
495 METRO PLACE SOUTH
SUITE 210
DUBLIN, OH 43017

EXAMINER	
FISCHETTI, JOSEPH A	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3627	

DATE MAILED: 05/07/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/354,870	WILSON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Joseph A. Fischetti	3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *28 February 2003* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-15 and 17-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-15, 17-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-15, 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Longfield in view of Hagemier and Furuhashi et al.

Longfield discloses completing a tax return for the filer, establishing a refund for the return; assigning a portion of the refund to an authorized credit institution or a spending vehicle provider (the loan established causes the refund to be returned not to the taxpayer but to the institution(see abstract) and therefore such a transaction can only be accomplished by an assignment). A credit institution is a spending vehicle provider because it is in the business of lending money which ultimately leads to spending by the person who obtains the loan.

However, the credit institution or the spending vehicle provider in Longfield does not have a spending vehicle as part of its system.

Hagemier does disclose combining a spending vehicle, i.e. credit card, with a tax crediting vehicle so that the credit obtained from the taxing system can be used toward purchases of products using the credit card. It would be obvious to modify the system and method in Longfield to include the spending vehicle of Hagemier because an authorized credit institution usually also issue credit cards as part of their services to customers and this would simplify the

buying process for the tax payer by using the credit card of the credit institution to which the refund has been applied.

The credit institution is read as obviously being for use at a participating outlet because the outlet at which the credit is used is deemed to be participating. It is suggested that applicant use the word "exclusive" to capture the feature he is attempting to advance in his arguments. Even still, the use of a spending vehicle which n is exclusive only to certain outlets is deemed a merely using a portion of the whole which is not deemed to be of patentable weight. Notwithstanding, Furuhashi et al. disclose an electronic check which since it is made to the order of a specific payee is deemed to be for exclusive use at the payee outlet.

Re claim 15, to award an individual more than the amount of the return is simply an old expedient in the art of marketing to induce people to use the system.

Re claim 6: the use of the refund to pay the preparer is known and would be considered part of the loan provided by the Longfield system.

Claims 1-15, 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Longfield and Furuhashi et al.

Longfield discloses completing a tax return for the filer, establishing a refund for the return; assigning a portion of the refund to an authorized credit institution or a spending vehicle provider (the loan established causes the refund to be returned not to the taxpayer but to the institution(see abstract) and therefore such a transaction can only be accomplished by an assignment). A credit institution is a spending vehicle provider because it is in the business of

lending money which ultimately leads to spending by the person who obtains the loan. The bank check is read as the spending vehicle. Notwithstanding, official notice is taken with respect to the use of a spending vehicles, such as a debit card or credit on a credit card, and accounts which are provided by any bank, credited by the amount of the return.

The credit institution is read as obviously being for use at a participating outlet because the outlet at which the credit is used is deemed to be participating. It is suggested that applicant use the word "exclusive" to capture the feature he is attempting to advance in his arguments. Even still, the use of a spending vehicle which n is exclusive only to certain outlets is deemed a merely using a portion of the whole which is not deemed to be of patentable weight. Notwithstanding, Furuhashi et al. disclose an electronic check which since it is made to the order of a specific payee is deemed to be for exclusive use at the payee outlet.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Joseph A. Fischetti at telephone number (703) 305-0731.

Primary Exam
3627